UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,834	12/30/2003	Todd A. Harvey	ATT/2003-0109	2779
	7590 03/31/201 L DEPARTMENT - V	EXAMINER		
PATENT DOC		HONG, HARRY S		
ROOM 2A-207, ONE AT& T WAY BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/31/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/748,834	HARVEY ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Harry S. Hong	2614			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 December 2009</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,9,10 and 12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,9,10 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application	on Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO.413)			
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/748,834 Page 2

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gillespie (US 6,823,048 B2; previously applied) in view of Chan (previously applied) and further in view of Lewis et al. (Lewis; US 6,532,490 B1; previously applied).

Application/Control Number: 10/748,834

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, and 12, the entire patent to Gillespie <u>plainly</u> and completely teaches by name the claimed method and apparatus for calling name caching in communication networks.

With respect to the limitations recited in claims 6, refer to column 5, lines 26 - 35.

Page 3

Gillespie differs from the claimed invention in that Gillespie is silent with respect to querying the remote database by the local cache. However, Chan plainly teaches querying a remote database by a local database (see Abstract, penultimate sentence). Therefore, it would have been obvious even to ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify the system of Gillespie to query the remote database(s) directly from the local cache as taught by Chan in order to save time and resources.

Gillespie in view of Chan further differs from the claimed invention in that Gillespie in view of Chan is silent with respect to querying over a signaling network different from a communication network carrying calls. However, Lewis plainly teaches performing secondary queries over a signaling network different from communication network carrying calls (see Figs. 1-3 which clearly show a separate PSTN). Therefore, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Gillespie in view of Chan to perform queries over a signaling network different from a communication network carrying calls as taught by Lewis since the motivation of out of band signaling is well established in the telephony art.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,834 Page 4

Art Unit: 2614

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed December 14, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Indeed, as stated by the applicants, the database 26 of Lewis is shown outside (read separate) the PSTN 18; the examiner never recited anything contrary to this fact. This is why the INE does not and cannot use the PSTN to obtain data but uses the signaling network. And this is why Lewis was applied; because the PSTN is the communication network and the INE uses the signaling network to perform the secondary query. Indeed, as again correctly pointed out by the applicants, Lewis fails to teach or suggest the database 26 being accessed via the PSTN. Because Lewis teaches database 26 being accessed via the signaling network.

Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, and 12 remain rejected as above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry S. Hong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7485. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harry S. Hong/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614